ase 1:21-cr-00065-R.ID Document 52 Filed 04/28/22 Page 1 of 29 PageID #: 591

ase 1:21-cr-00065-RJD_Document 52_Filed 04/28/22_Page 2 of 29 PageID #: 592

1	was sworn/affirmed.)		
2	THE DEFENDANT: I swear.		
3	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you.		
4	THE COURT: All right. Bear with me just a second.		
5	So, Mr. Martinelli Linares, I have to ask you a		
6	number of questions, as I'm sure Mr. Hecker has told you. If		
7	there's anything I say that isn't entirely clear to you, feel		
8	free to say so I'll do my best to clarify, rephrase any		
9	question. If you wish at any time to confer with counsel,		
10	simply ask me and I'll give you whatever time you need to		
11	speak privately with your lawyers, okay?		
12	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Judge.		
13	THE COURT: You should also bear in mind as we		
14	proceed that you are now under oath. That means that your		
15	answers to my questions must be truthful. If they were not in		
16	any material way, you could subject yourself to further		
17	charges for the offense of perjury, which is lying while under		
18	oath.		
19	Do you understand that?		
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.		
21	THE COURT: Could you state your full name please.		
22	THE DEFENDANT: Ricardo Alberto Martinelli Linares.		
23	THE COURT: How old are you, sir?		
24	THE DEFENDANT: Forty-two years old.		
25	THE COURT: What schooling or formal education have		

ase 1:21-cr-00065-R.ID_Document 52_Filed 04/28/22_Page 4 of 29 PageID #: 59

THE COURT: All right. Now, sir, the next series of questions are designed to establish as a matter of record that you understand the rights that you have and the rights that you give up by pleading guilty. Obviously, primary among them is the right to go to trial. You have an absolute right to continue in your plea of not guilty.

Do you understand that?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: Even if you are guilty, you have an absolute right to plead not guilty and to put the government to the burden of proving your guilty to the satisfaction of a jury and beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you understand?

Yes, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT:

25

THE COURT: Now in the course of the trial the witnesses for the government would have to come here to court and testify under oath in your presence, the presence of counsel of course. You would have the right therefore to confront each of these witnesses face to face here in the courtroom. You'd have the right, when appropriate, to object to evidence offered by the government, you'd have to the right to cross examine each of the witnesses, you'd have the right to offer evidence in your own defense, but you'd be under no obligation to do so, and you would have the right to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of possible evidence or documents and such through the use of a court order or subpoena, as we commonly refer to it.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: At trial, sir, you would have the right to testify in your own defense but under no obligation to do so. You have an absolute constitutional right or privilege, as we refer to it, to remain silent and no one can make you testify, not your lawyers, not the government's lawyers, not even the Court. You have an absolute right to remain silent. And if you chose to avail yourself of that right, and remain silent, and if counsel requested it of me, as he likely would, at trial I would instruct the jury in the strongest possible terms that under no circumstances could they, the jury, hold

ase 1:21-cr-00065-RJD_Document 52_Filed 04/28/22_Page 8 of 29 PageID #: 598

THE COURT: Have you read it carefully?

25

1	MR. HECKER: Your Honor, before he answers that can	
2	we just establish that the factual proffer in support of the	
3	plea is attached as an exhibit to the plea agreement.	
4	THE COURT: I'm more than happy to. It's not	
5	attached to mine, but I take your word for it, Mr. Hecker.	
6	MR. HECKER: Thank you, Judge.	
7	THE COURT: I have the plea agreement, I just don't	
8	have that yes.	
9	MR. REDMANN: Your Honor, paragraph 6 of the plea	
10	agreement incorporates that as Exhibit A.	
11	THE COURT: All right. Okay, fair enough.	
12	Including a three-page proffer statement in support of the	
13	guilty plea which is now attached to and part of the agreement	
14	itself.	
15	And that I take it is a stipulated statement.	
16	MR. REDMANN: Correct, your Honor, and it's signed	
17	by the defendant.	
18	THE COURT: I'm sorry?	
19	MR. REDMANN: That's correct, your Honor, and it's	
20	signed by the defendant.	
21	THE COURT: Thank you for that, because I'm just	
22	about to get to it.	
23	You signed this agreement, sir?	
24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.	
25	THE COURT: You signed it Mr. Hecker, you	

PROCEEDINGS 1 witnessed the execution of the agreement? 2 MR. HECKER: I did. 3 THE COURT: Do you have any questions about this 4 agreement? 5 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. Okay. Count One reads as follows: 6 THE COURT: 7 or about and between August 2009 and September 2015, both 8 dates being approximate and inclusive, within the Eastern District of New York and elsewhere, the defendants charged, 9 10 including Ricardo Alberto Martinelli Linares together with 11 others, did knowingly and intentionally conspire to conduct offenses under Title 18, United States Code Sections 1956 and 12 13 1957 to wit: To transport, transmit and transfer, and attempt to 14 15 transport, transmit and transfer monetary instruments and 16 funds from a place in the United States to and through a place 17 outside the United States and to a place in the United States 18 from and through a place outside the United States with the 19 intent to promote the carrying on of one or more specified 20 unlawful activities, to wit: An offense against a foreign 21 nation involving bribery of a public official, in violation of 22 the Penal Code of the Republic of Panama, contrary to 18 23 U.S.C. Sections 1956(a)(2)(A); 24 to conduct and attempt to conduct financial

to conduct and attempt to conduct financial transactions involving the proceeds of one or more specified

25

might have had?

THE DEFENDANT: He has, your Honor.

THE COURT: You're charged with the offense of conspiracy. What is your understanding of the nature of a conspiracy? What is a conspiracy.

THE DEFENDANT: It's an agreement between me and others to carry out an illegal act.

THE COURT: A plus. That's it, it's the agreement itself. That's the nature of the offense charged in Count One, the agreement, not whether you did it, but you agreed to do it.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now we'll turn back to your plea agreement to discuss matters of sentencing. This discussion, sir, comes essentially in three parts. First, is the statutory penalties that the Congress has written into the law that you face, then we'll discuss briefly the so-called sentencing guidelines, and finally, I will explain what the law ultimately requires of me.

All right. As you'll see in paragraph one of your plea agreement, you face a maximum -- pardon me. You face a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years in prison, that is 20 years without parole, and there is no parole in the federal system.

Do you understand that? In effect, that's the worse thing that could happen, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: There is no mandatory minimum sentence, but you face a term of three years supervised release.

Supervised release is a term of supervision that begins to run the moment you are released from federal custody. In your case it may have little relevance, but let me just explain it to you nonetheless.

If you were to violate the terms or conditions of your supervised release at any time during the period of supervision, you could be returned to prison under the terms of my sentence in this case for up to two years without any credit being given to you for the time you spent at liberty under supervision. You follow?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: A quick example that comes to mind that might be relevant in your case is if you're removed from the United States and then you illegally return, that would be a violation of your supervised release, okay, among other things.

Okay. The statute also provides for a fine of up to \$500,000 or twice the gross gain or loss, whichever is greater. Restitution is mandatory in an amount to be determined by the Court at some subsequent proceeding with the

assistance of counsel. A special assessment will be imposed as is required of \$100, and as I've already mentioned and as you're quite aware I assume from your agreement, you will be removed from the United States following the service of your sentence.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now those are the statutory penalties that you face. We are -- now we turn to the subject of the sentencing guidelines. I note from your agreement that you agree with the calculation suggested by the government in your agreement of the sentencing guidelines. They address the question of where within this very broad range of zero to 20 years you should be sentenced. I should add that the guidelines are not binding on the Court, but I am required as a first step in the sentencing process to consider the guidelines range.

Now, the government has, with your agreement, calculated a sentencing range in this case of between 108 to 135 months assuming a Criminal History Category of I, which based upon counsel's letter I suggest will be the case. Okay. I can't tell you whether I agree with that range or not, I may very well agree with it, I'm not in a position to do that until after I have received the presentence report prepared by the Probation Department with your input, counsel's input, as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

well as the government's. That report will tell the story of the case, your involvement in it. It will provide a biography, any history, criminal history or what. It will also reflect the Probation Department's recommended calculation of the guidelines range. You'll see that report before I do. You'll be given an opportunity to voice objection or otherwise comment. Eventually the report will come to me. At that point it's my obligation to calculate the guidelines for myself. If there are any material facts that weigh on the calculation of the guideline sentencing range or may affect the sentencing judgment itself, the first order of business will be to resolve those differences, and that can be done in a number of ways, either through informal presentation by counsel or, if necessary, as a result following a full evidentiary hearing here in court, okay. Once those facts are established, I will apply the facts to the quidelines, as I understand them, and thereby calculate the sentencing range. Okay, that gets us to the third and final part of what sentencing is required of me. I'm required to impose a

what sentencing is required of me. I'm required to impose a reasonable sentence. Now a reasonable sentence could be defined as follows: A sentence that first considers the advisory guideline range, considers as well any statutory factors concerning the offense, any offense characteristics, any information about you and your background, anything at all that counsel brings to my attention, either your counsel or

government counsel, that might bear on the question of the appropriate sentence. At that point after considering all of that, I am required to impose what the law regards as a reasonable sentence.

Now I mentioned a moment ago that with the exception of sentence, there is no right to an appeal. Well, now let me explain the exception, and you're familiar with this from paragraph 4 of your plea agreement.

MR. HECKER: Your Honor, may I just have a one moment to confer with the government about paragraph 4?

THE COURT: Certainly, go ahead.

(Counsel confer.)

THE COURT: Everybody on the same page?

MR. HECKER: We are, Judge.

THE COURT: I started to say with respect to paragraph 4, you have agreed, as I understand it, you tell me what your understanding is, that you will not appeal the judgment of sentence or conviction either directly or what we call collaterally, in any way challenge it, as long as I impose a sentence of 151 months or less. All right. If I go 152 months, you have a right to appeal that sentence. And if you could no longer afford the fees and expenses associated with that appeal including counsel fees, it would be paid by the Court under the authority of the Criminal Justice Act.

All right? But as I understand it, any sentence 151 months or

1 less, there is no right of appeal. So no matter what I do, no 2 matter how many mistakes I make, legally or factually, and 3 impose a sentence of 151 months or less, case closed, no right 4 of appeal. That's my understanding. 5 Is it your understanding? THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, it is my understanding 6 7 as well. 8 THE COURT: All right. I think we touched all the 9 bases here. 10 MR. REDMANN: Your Honor, one issue of penalty is 11 the forfeiture. 12 THE COURT: Did I miss that? 13 MR. REDMANN: Yes, your Honor. There's a forfeiture 14 money judgment agreed to in the amount \$18,892,532.40 and the 15 forfeiture provisions are paragraphs 7 through 13 of the plea 16 agreement. 17 THE COURT: All right. Correct, Mr. Hecker? 18 MR. HECKER: Yes, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: I didn't see it in the plea agreement 20 itself, but it is in the -- it's not in the -- it is in the 21 plea agreement, but further down, okay. So as a result of 22 your conviction, Mr. Martinelli Linares, you have agreed to 23 forfeit that sum of money. 24 Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT:

I do, your Honor.

25

1 THE COURT: Now I haven't touched on every provision 2 in this plea agreement quite obviously. You've assured me 3 that you reviewed it thoroughly with counsel, you have no 4 questions of the Court, I have your assurance you're fully 5 familiar with everything in the agreement? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I'm fully familiar. 7 THE COURT: Bear with me a second. All right. turn to the plea itself. Are you ready to plea? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: I am, your Honor. 10 What is your plea to Count One of the THE COURT: indictment 21-CR-65, guilty or not guilty? 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty. 13 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am, your Honor. 15 Has anyone pressured you in any way to THE COURT: 16 plead guilty? 17 THE DEFENDANT: No, they have not, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Has anybody made any promises to you 19 that are not reflected in your plea agreement? 20 THE DEFENDANT: No, they have not, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Has anybody given you any assurances as 22 to what I will do on the question of sentence? 23 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right, then, sir, it's alleged that 25 in Count One that you conspired to commit money laundering.

Did you do that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Tell me what you did.

THE DEFENDANT: Between August 2009 and September 2015 I agreed with other people, including my brother Luis, to wire funds that were the proceeds of bribes paid by Odebrecht to a family member of mine who was a government official in Panama.

We caused those funds to be wired into an account in the United States to facilitate the bribery of the government official in Panama, which was in violation of Panama law. And I also agreed to cause further transactions into and out of the United States with proceeds of the same bribery scheme, in part to conceal where they came from and who they were for.

I also agreed to establish offshore bank accounts in the names of offshore shell companies in order to receive and disguise the bribe payments and to serve as a signatory on some of those accounts.

Between 2009 and 2012, \$28 million in bribe proceeds from Odebrecht were transferred into the accounts for the benefit of a senior official in Panama, with more than \$19 million of those payments transferred to U.S. banks, some of which were located in New York.

THE COURT: Well, I just simply note for the record that this attachment to the plea agreement goes beyond that, I

just want to make sure I've got the right attachment.

MR. HECKER: Correct, your Honor. The factual proffer that Mr. Martinelli Linares agreed to is a fuller description of the conduct.

THE COURT: Okay, fair enough. Satisfied with the allocution?

MR. REDMANN: Yes, your Honor. I just want to ask that if there's an agreement or stipulation that the Panama government official described meets the elements of a public servant under Panamanian law.

MR. HECKER: Yes, no dispute, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Hecker?

MR. HECKER: No, your Honor.

MR. REDMANN: Your Honor, just on the point of venue, we want to note that there is a waiver of venue in the plea agreement and that in addition that the government would show if — at a trial, absent a waiver, that there is a venue because the defendant was first brought to the Eastern District of New York at JFK Airport and the conduct began overseas and, secondly, that there's venue because the financial transactions, the communications, electronic communications in furtherance of them occurred in the Eastern District of New York.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. I note the venue waiver in the agreement.

Based on the information given to me I find that the defendant is acting voluntarily, he fully understands his rights, the consequences and possible consequences of his plea and that there is factual bases for the plea of guilty. I, therefore, now formally accept the plea of guilty to Count One of indictment 21-CR-65.

I urge you, Mr. Martinelli Linares, to cooperate with the Probation Department in their preparation of the presentence report consistent of course with the advice of counsel.

I direct the government to maintain the possession of the original plea agreement and ask the Clerk of the Court to announce the date of sentence.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: May 13th, 2022, 11 a.m.

MR. HECKER: Your Honor, if I may. We do request expedited sentencing in this case and I recognize that in these times of COVID that often the Probation Department needs more time. I would just note for the record, my understanding that Mr. Martinelli Linares's brother's probation interview for the PSI is this week and my real expectation is that we'd be prepared for a sentencing much earlier than May. So I just want to note for the Court that we will be pushing for a much earlier date for sentencing if the report is ready in time.

THE COURT: I understand that and we'll be ready when you are, let's put it that way. Given the full range of

circumstances it seems appropriate that the Probation

Department be encouraged to give this their immediate

attention. Anything else?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HECKER: Yes, your Honor, on behalf of Mr. Martinelli Linares we want to ask the Court to reconsider the issue of bail now that the plea has been entered. would just say we did argue for bail on Saturday when we were in front of Magistrate Judge Levy and he denied that request, but I think recognized that there was a real difference between asking for bail in the run up to a plea and then after a plea, and the reason of course is because the incentives for an individual to flee changes pretty dramatically. And in fact, the government in this case in arguing for detention has repeatedly emphasized that back in June of 2020 when Mr. Martinelli Linares and his brother were negotiating with the government, they left, they fled. They made a mistake of pretty epic proportions, it's resulted in my client spending 17 months in a Guatemalan prison and since Saturday being at the MDC where, other coming to court, he was allowed out of his cell for 10 minutes to take a shower on Sunday because he's in quarantine, notwithstanding that he's had two vaccinations and a booster shot, but the upshot of all of this is that we're now in a very different posture.

Sometime ago my client made a decision, with his brother, to resolve this case and negotiated a plea agreement,

PROCEEDINGS

which was signed while he was still in a Guatemalan prison. He's now entered that plea and, as the Court knows, our intention is to move forward to a sentencing at which point we'll be asking the Court to consider a sentence of time served given all the facts and circumstances of the case. I fully recognize that of course the Court will need to consider all of the information before making a judgment about that, but that's what the intention of my client is. And it's important to understand there are still open charges in Panama. One of the reasons for the clear factual proffer in this case is to try ensure that he's not re-prosecuted in Panama for the very same charges.

So to be very clear, the plan has been for some time and remains, to have judgment entered in this case, once

Mr. Martinelli Linares has served his time here, to go back to Panama and to argue in Panama that he has already done his time and served his penalty in connection with what we believe is the same offense charged in two different countries.

The upshot of all of that is my client has zero reason to flee. And in those circumstances, after a plea, we respectfully think that there are conditions that can be set, including with a substantial bail package. We proposed a bond of \$5 million secured by two and a half million dollars of my client's own cash which can be further secured through suretors. We have a list of seven. I don't know that you

need seven. A couple of them have property including in this district that they'd put up because they believe he's going to resolve his case here and await sentencing. And on those facts we think we presented a clear case for setting bail with appropriate conditions.

THE COURT: Okay. You want to be heard?

MS. SMITH: Yes, your Honor. I mean, I think one thing Mr. Hecker and I agree on is that the burden does shift at the plea, it actually shifts against the defendant. And the reason for that is because once you've pled, the consequences of that plea are going to happen as opposed to they could happen.

I think the argument that he has nothing to gain by fleeing now as opposed to say last week and that he came to the U.S. to plead guilty are -- we would strongly disagree with both of them.

If he had intended to come here and resolve charges, he would have waived immediately and come and pled. Instead, he stayed in Guatemala fighting extradition to Panama — fighting our extradition here so that he could get back to Panama. The same criminal charges that Mr. Hecker is talking about have been pending since the time of their flight. So when they were fighting in Guatemala to get back to Panama and not to come here, they knew those criminal charges were pending and they made a clear choice, both when they fled and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

when they were fighting extradition that they would prefer to face those charges in Panama than to come here. And, in fact, I mean they were willing to sit in a prison in Guatemala for 17 months and fight those charges rather than come back to the United States.

So I think the truth is that the calculus has not changed, because all that has happened is the inevitable plea, which I think right now they are quilty and the decision to plead quilty makes sense, but they have not yet gotten that final sentence. And there is still the prospect of additional jail time in the United States as opposed to Guatemala. There's still the prospect of \$19 million in forfeiture, which far outweighs the amount that they would put up for bail. defendant is also an Italian citizen, so there are other countries to which he could flee and, you know, obviously I think you had said and acknowledged, originally when we were doing the bail argument for his brother, he has access to great wealth so he has the means and the political connections to make that flight happen. So for all of those reasons we don't believe that he can show his burden of not being a flight risk.

In addition, the package that's been put up I would argue, while we don't believe there's any conditions that would assure his return to court, is grossly inadequate given the amount of forfeiture that he's facing, the access to

PROCEEDINGS

wealth that he has. Just in the PSR it lists \$4.9 million in real estate and \$3.2 million in cash that the defendant has himself separate and apart from his family wealth.

So in addition I think our prospective is, there are no conditions but certainly the bail package that's been offered would be insufficient.

THE COURT: Well, you know, we had this, was it last week or the week before with his brother. I'm one who tries his best to arrange for people to be released for any number of reasons not the least of which is he's now in a presentencing posture, the need to confer and collaborate with counsel in terms of effective sentencing presentation is paramount.

Mr. Hecker, you have marshaled every argument I could conceivably think of in support of his release, but I honestly don't see what's changed. Yes, he's entered a plea of guilty. I acknowledge that, but in terms of his incentives, I don't know what's changed, and actions do speak louder than words and unfortunately the actions in this case, we can call them a mistake, a grave mistake, a misjudgment because they put him in a Guatemalan prison for 17 months, I'm just not convinced. The full circumstances of his departure in 2020, including the planes, the boats and the phony credentials and the health waiver and everything else, this is somebody who planned an escape to put it bluntly, and although

PROCEEDINGS

he may be sincere right now, were he to somehow elude the jurisdiction of this Court, I don't know how he would be in any worse shape than he would have been had he been permitted into Panama back in June of 2020.

I'm going to have to turn you down, I don't think you've met your burden. I can't say that there isn't a sum of money at some point where I might say, well, maybe that's standard, but I don't think we're anywhere near that to be honest with you. So I'm not going to upset Judge Levy's determination.

I think the thing to do, as we've suggested already during the discussion, is to move it promptly through the presentence phase and get the man and his brother up for sentencing and we'll see what happens.

Have a nice day, folks.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.

(Matter concluded.)

19 * * * * *

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

22 <u>s/ Georgette K. Betts</u> <u>December 27, 2021</u>

23 GEORGETTE K. BETTS DATE

24

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

25